



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,138	04/01/2004	Robert James Salmi	1370.066US1	2503
21186 7590 01/13/2009 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2432				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/13/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/816,138

**Applicant(s)**

SALMI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Venkat Perungavoor

**Art Unit**

2432

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14, 16-58, 60-68 and 70-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-5, 15, 59, 69 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant's arguments regarding generating a configuration data abstraction layer of an intermediate layer comprising fields, operators and arguments for routing policy. And further the verification of intermediate layer against a set of rules for client protocols or generating complied policy transmission language including version thereof. Strasner discloses the configuration data having fields including {V,T,M,P,OS} that used for specific devices see Par. 0070 & Par. 0072 & Par. 0060. And further configuration takes into account the different version for mapping device specific configuration see Par. 0060. The configuration manager has the task of approving changes, installing changes and verifying changes see Par. 0052. Additionally, the configuration changes to be inherited from higher layers and translate rules and procedures to configure network resources see Par. 0055.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1,13,19-20, 55,65,81,87-88, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2004/0230681 to Strassner et al.(Strassner).

Regarding Claim 1, 13,19-20, 87-88, Strassner discloses the controller to generate a data abstraction layer of a routing policy, the configuration data abstraction layer to map a routing policy configuration to an intermediate layer comprising fields, operators and

arguments see Fig. 4 & Fig. 5 item 504 & Par. 0043 & Par. 0059; a policy repository to verify the intermediate layer against a set of verification rules for one or more client protocols including versions thereof, the policy repository to verify field-operator pairings in the routing policy, and to verify one or more arguments used for each field-operator pairing in the routing policy the policy repository to generate complied policy transmission language for use by the one or more client protocols including versions thereof. 0043 & Par. 0070 & Par. 0060 & Par. 0052.

Regarding Claim 55, 65, 81, Strassner discloses the generating libraries for attach points associated with one or more versions of one or more client protocols, the libraries to include capabilities for the one or more versions of the one or more client protocols see Fig. 7 (where classes are points as classes includes libraries and variables that are accessible for all protocols, i.e. globally accessible); and individually checking statements of a routing policy against the capabilities of one or more of the attach points see Fig. 2 item 202 & Fig. 14 item 4002 & Fig. 1B item 127 & Par. 0045.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-3,6-12,14,16-18,21-53, 55-58,60-64,66-78, 80,82-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2004/0230681 to Strassner et al.(Strassner) in view of US Patent Publication 2004/0039942 to Cooper et al.(Cooper).

Regarding Claim 2, 14, 76, 82, Strassner does not disclose the one or more protocols. However, Cooper discloses the generating the complied policy transmission language for use by the one or more clients protocols including versions thereof see Par. 0533 & Par. 0276. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include one or more client protocols in the invention of Strassner in order to map protocols various protocols to modules as taught in Coopers Fig. 17 item 6109.

Regarding Claim 3, 79, Cooper discloses the verifying the field-operator pairings in the policy and based on rules associated with dynamic link library(DLL) see Table L Page 20(where the list of fields are checked for compliance).

Regarding Claim 6-7, 77-78, 80, 83-86, Strassner discloses the attach point being a set of capabilities associated versions of client protocols and verifying of protocols see Par. 0070 & Par.0060.

Regarding Claim 8-11, 16-17, Cooper discloses the compiler generates a dynamic link library for each policy see Par. 0116 and optimizing the policies see Par. 0411 & Par. 0390.

Regarding Claim 12, 18, Cooper discloses the using of cached policies for subsequent operations see Fig. 1B & Par. 0043.

Regarding Claim 56-58, 66-68, Cooper discloses the verifying the field-operator pairings in the policy and based on rules associated with dynamic link library(DLL) see Table L Page 20(where the list of fields are checked for compliance).

Regarding Claim 60-64, 70-72, Cooper discloses the ignores of action based on the rules and protocols see Fig. 12 item 2004 and further of outputting conditions of outcomes see Fig. 12 item 2011& 2012.

Regarding Claim 73-75, Strassner discloses the generating libraries for attach points associated with one or more versions of one or more client protocols, the libraries to include capabilities for the one or more versions of the one or more client protocols see Fig. 7(where classes are points as classes includes libraries and variables that are accessible for all protocols, i.e. globally accessible) ; and individually checking statements of a routing policy against the capabilities of one or more of the attach points see Fig. 2 item 202 & Fig. 14 item 4002 & Fig. 1B item 127 & Par. 0045. Cooper further

discloses the ignores of action based on the rules and protocols see Fig. 12 item 2004 and further of outputting conditions of outcomes see Fig. 12 item 2011& 2012.

It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include verifying the routing policies in the invention of Strassner in order to monitor traffic and build trust relationships as taught in Cooper see Par. 0043.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 4-5, 15, 59, 69 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkat Perungavoor whose telephone number is (571)272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

/N. P./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2432  
January 7, 2009

/Gilberto Barron Jr/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432